



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

made in an attempt to save the dowry and the seven minas. In that case the *καὶ πρότερον τρὸς τὸν συνδίκους* of § 32 will refer to the former trial and not to the preliminary hearing (*ἀνάκρισις*) of the present one.

LYSIAS 18. 14

πάντες γὰρ εἴσονται ὅτι τότε μὲν χιλίαις δραχμαῖς ἐξημίωσε τὸν βουλόμενον τὴν ἡμετέραν γῆν δημοσίαν ποιῆσαι κτέ.

Among the numerous emendations of this section I do not find that anyone has ever proposed *ἐξημιώσατ'* *ἄν*, and yet the simple insertion of an *ἄν* removes many difficulties. In the first place it explains how *ἐξημιώσατ'*, which is certainly right, was corrupted to *ἐξημίωσε*, for the *rav* would be easily dropped before *τόν*. This corruption would not occur so easily before *αὐτόν*, and, indeed, if this first trial is purely hypothetical, it is no longer necessary to have a reference to Poliochus in this clause, and we can retain the *τόν* of X. The point of the whole passage from § 13 to § 19 is that the Athenians, by confiscating the property in question, will break their oath *μὴ μνησικακεῖν* (§ 19). This is the oath referred to in the *περὶ ὀντὸν ὄρκους δημωμόκατε* of § 13, and the *ἄ δὲ αὐτοῖς ἐψηφίσασθε* of § 15. In the closing words of § 14 Lysias, indeed, speaks as if the assumed former trial were an actual one, but that is a mere trick, of which he is quite capable. In defense of *παρανόμως φεύγοντος τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἀνδρός* he could claim that the case had already been decided once when the citizens voted to forget past wrongs.

If the insertion of *ἄν* is right, and there were not two trials, the *τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἀνδρός* cannot possibly refer to Poliochus. We thus get rid of the possibility that the speech was made in a *γραφὴ παρανόμων* against Poliochus, as Thalheim still assumes in his *Argumentum* (p. xlivi), and the *σύνδικοι* of § 26 will be the presiding officers. And, finally, we are relieved of the very improbable assumption that a man, who had already been fined 1,000 drachmas for an illegal act, would venture to bring a second suit, which could be attacked as doubly illegal, because it was contrary both to the decree *μὴ μνησικακεῖν* and to the law against a second suit about the same matter.

A. G. LAIRD

CICERO'S *DE SENECTUTE*, §§ 10 AND 37

In Cicero's *De senectute* 10, the Brussels MS (Bruxellensis 9591), tenth century, reads *virtus gravitas* and furnishes an explanation of a corruption which has appeared in most of the other MSS. *Virtus* was originally a gloss on *gravitas* which has here crept into the text without the change to *gravis* made by the scribes in other MSS to emend the sentence. This corrected reading, *virtus gravis*, also appears in A (Ashburnhamensis) and L (Leidensis), the other members of the family to which Br belongs, and represents, as stated above, the variation of their scribes from the original

virtus gravitas. In E (Erfurtensis), twelfth century, the gloss was inserted after *gravitas* instead of before, but the same subsequent change has occurred. A confirmation of the fact that *virtus* is a gloss is found in the reading of the second hand of V (Vossianus), thirteenth century, where *virtus* is not put into the text but occurs as a variant upon *gravitas*. Later, in MSS which had retained the original reading *gravitas*, as in H (Harleianus), eleventh century, the false reading *virtus gravis* was also inserted because found in other MSS and not for the same primary cause.

In § 37 of the *De senectute*, the reading of Br, *illa domos patrius disciplina*, is again indicative of the reading of the archetype of the other two members of its family, A and L. For the corruption *domos*, so easily formed from *domo+mos*, next gave way to *domus* as *domos* would not construe. Then, in order to avoid an apparently false agreement with *domus*, the *patrius* was changed to *patria* P² (according to Dahl), *patris* A², or *patri* A¹ and L¹, that it might agree with or be in some subjective relation to *disciplina*, the *et* necessarily disappearing for this purpose. We thus account for the reading of A¹, *illa domus patri disciplina*, while the repetition of *domus* by L¹ is probably a blunder of its own scribe. The *et* was probably dropped from Br, as in the great majority of the other MSS, through the failure to observe the plural subject and a desire to construe *disciplina* as ablative. This may, however, have been the initial stage of the corruption in all three MSS. The reading of ER, *illa domo mos patrius et disciplina*, was thus undoubtedly the reading of the archetype of AL Br and, though not necessarily the correct reading, yet furnishes the best tradition in this disputed passage. I propose shortly to publish a complete collation of Br with an indication of its various affinities.

GEORGE R. THROOP

WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

“JUSTICE IN THE AGE OF HOMER”

In his examination of the much-discussed trial-scene in Homer's *Iliad* xviii. 497–508, Professor Bonner (“Justice in the Age of Homer,” *Classical Philology* VI, 24 ff.) rightly concludes, I think, that the two talents which lie before the judges are the stakes contributed by the litigants (one talent each), and are “to be paid over to the one of them who shall plead his case before the court most effectively”—that is, win the verdict (vs. 508). Professor Bonner has also not disregarded the earlier suggested parallelisms with procedure under primitive Roman law. But his concluding sentence (p. 30) is: “In effect the wager [i.e., the two talents in this specific case] corresponds to the damages which according to Homeric practice usually accompanied restitution and redress.” That is, the beaten litigant is mulcted in penal damages to the amount of one talent, presum-